

6/8/05

ATTN: Mr Thanh K. Truong

From Edward M. Bogue

5 pages sent not including cover.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 09 2005

Edward M. Bogue
155 Amston Road
Colchester, CT. 06415
Phone (860)659-9660
Fax (860)657-3860

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 09 2005

June 8, 2005

Mr. Thanh K. Truong, Examiner
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Art Unit 3721
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RE: Application No. 10/802,328

Dear Mr. Truong:

The following is in response to the office action dated 3/22/2005. Thank you for discussing the office action on my patent application. Attached are the revised claims for the application. There are a number of claims that have been withdrawn due to valid issues brought up in the latest office action. Item numbers 3,5 and 9 in the office action have been addressed with the cancellation of the claims associated with them.

The following applies to item number 7 in the office action. Claim #1 has been revised to give more clarity and detail. In my reading of Patent #5,868,208 I find no reference to the output shaft being driven in the reverse direction, in fact every claim involves an second overrunning clutch or a damping device which sole purpose is to prevent any reversal of the tool drive shaft. The author of this patent always attempted to stop any reversal of the output shaft. There also may be some confusion in terminology between #5,868,208 and my patent application. In my application (and most in this field) the output shaft is the part which a chuck or screwdriver bit may be attached to; in #5,868,208 this is called a tool drive shaft. In #5,868,208 the output shaft is a part inside the device that is the output of the motor. This is why the patent states a

reversal of the output shaft (from an oscillation motor) but this is completely different from my concept. The reference to a reversal is the one cited in the summary (column 2, lines 26-32), but nowhere in the design is anything that can drive the output shaft in reverse. The reference to a reversal is clarified in column 3 lines 47-54 and column 4 lines 6-21. Here it becomes apparent the reversal is an undesirable side effect caused by the first overrunning clutch of his design that is "cured" (i.e. reversals prevented) with a second overrunning clutch or a frictional bearing. The idea that a drill driver should be made which allows reversals is not implied or obvious from reading #5,868,208.

Claim 28 was rejected citing Peisert (column 6, lines 33-43). I think my explanation of vertical load may need some clarification. Peisert is referring to a rotational torque which when a preset limit is exceeded the device will stop rotation. Claim 28 is referring to the vertical load (i.e. compression of the output shaft). The assumption is the vertical load is caused by the operator attempting to keep the screwdriver bit in a screw by pressing significantly on the drill driver. This would be a case where the reversals should be engaged or the frequency increased due to the screwdriver bit being likely to strip the screw head.

I hope the revisions made are acceptable. If any more changes are needed or would simplify the application process please let me know; any suggestions are greatly appreciated.

Thanks Ed Bogue

